UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,964	09/12/2003	Vijay V. Sarashetti	200600636-1	1087

22879 7590 08/17/2010

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER	
VO, TRUONG V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2156	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/662,964
Filing Date: September 12, 2003
Appellant(s): SARASHETTI, VIJAY V.

Alan D. Christenson
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 07, 2010 appealing from the Office action mailed March 01, 2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The Examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The Appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The Appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claim Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

(US 2003/0030656 A1)	Ang et al.	02-2003
(US 2004/0030607 A1)	Gibson	02-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ang et al. (US 2003/0030656 A1) in view of Gibson (US 2004/0030607 A1).

3. **Regarding claim 1**, Ang teaches a computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising: assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site (i.e., each of the pointers used as such includes

either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed; [0049]).

Ang teaches entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure stored in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes (i.e., the text builder program reads records from the portable database file and creates a hierarchy for the data therein, in BCEML, using an algorithm to arrange the hierarchy into a conventional genealogical structure. To display a particular target record, each target record is displayed in a genealogical tree with its eldest ancestor record, parent records connecting the target record to the ancestor, sibling records, and all children of the target record. The text builder, or " hierarchy builder", produces the desired output using tags derived from the customized BCEML markup language, to create objects such as hyperlinks, bolded text, and the styled formatting to be viewed on the display of the portable computing device. For each record in the portable computer database file, the text builder builds the hierarchy by assigning a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree. Furthermore, once a child link is tapped, the child pointer in each record allows the program to retrieve all records linked below the record as "children" of such a record. Furthermore, each of the pointers used as such includes

either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed. This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records; [0049]).

Ang teaches sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 1, one or more central databases 105 are connected to the communications network 101. Each database 105 is equipped with a database management system (DBMS). The DBMS may take any form such as relational, flat, network or hierarchical, and may support different query languages, including semi-standardized query languages such as structured query language (SQL), as well as more sophisticated fourth-generation languages for managing database systems; [0029]).

Ang teaches receiving requests from the central storage site to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site (i.e., although server 110, central database 105, conversion processor 115 are shown as three separate devices in FIG. 1, it is contemplated that these devices can be implemented as three or fewer devices. As is more specifically described below, data in the central database 105 is processed and converted by the conversion processor 115 and placed onto the network server 110. A user connected to the network 101 may then obtain the processed data for use in the portable computing device 120; [0034]… a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database.

For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]-[0049]… in step S565, the end-user may transfer the files to portable computing device 120 for rendering and viewing thereon in accordance with the system and method described herein; [0058]).

However, Ang does not explicitly disclose receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site.

Meanwhile, Gibson discloses record keeping; [0041]. This is similar to Ang teaching because of the record keeping aspect. Furthermore, Gibson discloses receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site (i.e., receiving the TRN and order data from the merchants site the transaction processing system generates an internal transaction record reference (TRR); [0047]).

Gibson teaches producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site; storing the record in a memory location in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site (i.e., the TRN and uniquely identifies the order within the transaction processing system, and returns it to the merchants site for storage in the order pending file for future reference against the order, step 120. The TRR is stored together with the TRN and order data of this transaction in Step 122; [0047]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, having the teachings of Ang and Gibson before him/her, to modify

the method of Ang with the teaching of Gibson to improves record keeping. The motivation to combine is apparent in Ang's reference, because it is highly desirable to provide a system and method for organizing, storing, and allowing users to retrieve information efficiently; (see Ang, [0013]). Therefore, it would be advantageous to implement the record keeping aspect of Ang with Gibson transaction system in order to efficiently provide a record proof for the transaction; (see Gibson, [0077]).

4. **Regarding claim 2**, Ang teaches using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report of records collected by the record collection site (i.e., for each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database; [0047]).

Ang teaches sending the aggregate report to the central storage site (i.e., see FIG. 1, #120 sending to #105).

5. **Regarding claim 3**, Ang teaches using the unique identifier at the central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site (i.e., a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database; [0047]).

6. **Regarding claim 4**, Ang teaches wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure (i.e., for each

record in the portable computer database file, the text builder builds the hierarchy by assigning a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree. Furthermore, once a child link is tapped, the child pointer in each record allows the program to retrieve all records linked below the record as "children" of such a record. Furthermore, each of the pointers used as such includes either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed. This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records; [0049]).

7. **Regarding claim 5**, Ang teaches wherein the node is located in a higher position of the hierarchical tree structure than the unique identifier (i.e., a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree; [0049]).

8. **Regarding claim 6**, Ang teaches wherein using the unique identifier to produce the aggregate report includes counting the unique identifier with a second unique identifier assigned to a second record stored at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 8A-FIG. 8E).

9. **Regarding claim 7**, Ang teaches wherein using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report includes summing data included in the record accessed by the unique identifier with data included in a second record accessed by a second unique identifier (i.e., the user may expand the size of second window 820, to reveal more of such field data, as illustrated in FIG. 8E; [0066]).

10. **Regarding claim 8**, Ang teaches wherein a unique key that includes information representing a second node in the hierarchical tree structure is assigned to the node (i.e., as shown in FIG. 8A-FIG. 8E a unique key can be interpreted as the unique name #832).

11. **Regarding claim 9**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

12. **Regarding claim 10**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

13. **Regarding claim 11**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

14. **Regarding claim 12**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

15. **Regarding claim 13**, is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

16. **Regarding claim 14**, is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

17. **Regarding claim 15**, is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

18. **Regarding claim 16**, is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

19. **Regarding claim 17**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

20. **Regarding claim 18**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

21. **Regarding claim 19**, is essentially the same as claims 2 and 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

22. **Regarding claim 20**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

23. **Regarding claim 21**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

24. **Regarding claim 22**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

25. **Regarding claim 23**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

26. **Regarding claim 24**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

27. **Regarding claim 25**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

28. **Regarding claim 26**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

29. **Regarding claim 27**, Ang discloses wherein assigning a unique identifier to a record stored at a record collection site comprises: producing a record at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

Ang discloses producing a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site (i.e., a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database. For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]).

Ang discloses assigning a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

Ang discloses entering the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 1 and FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

30. **Regarding claim 28**, most of the limitations of this claim have been met in the rejection of claim 27 above. Ang further discloses tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

31. **Regarding claim 29**, most of the limitations of this claim have been met in the rejection of claim 28 above. Ang further discloses the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8 and for each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]).

32. **Regarding claim 30**, is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

33. **Regarding claim 31**, is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

34. **Regarding claim 32**, is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

35. **Regarding claim 33**, is essentially the same as claim 27 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

36. **Regarding claim 34**, is essentially the same as claim 28 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

37. **Regarding claim 35**, is essentially the same as claim 29 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

38. **Regarding claim 36**, is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

39. **Regarding claim 37**, is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

40. **Regarding claim 38**, is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments related to limitations in claims 1-38

(A) Appellant argues that "[e]ven assuming, arguendo, that Ang teaches assigning and entering unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structures, Ang's assignment and entering unique identifiers does not occur on the same device that receives an order for a transaction and stores a corresponding record. Further, Ang's unique identifiers are not even related to transaction records as in claim 1."

(B) Appellant argues that "there is no interaction between any two entities in Ang, Gibson, or the combination thereof, comparable to the interaction between the claimed 'record collection side' and 'central storage site' in limitations 6 and 7 of claim 1."

(C) Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "production of aggregate reports of transaction-related records at a record collection site and subsequent transfer of the aggregate reports to a central storage site."

(D) Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "aggregate reports of transaction-related records... regarding how aggregate reports are produced."

(E) Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "send[ing] an aggregate report of record type counts at the record collection site based on the unique identifiers in the hierarchical tree structure,

the aggregate report being sent to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site."

(F) Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site."

As to point (A), in rejecting claim 1, Appellant argues that "[e]ven assuming, arguendo, that Ang teaches assigning and entering unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structures, Ang's assignment and entering unique identifiers does not occur on the same device that receives an order for a transaction and stores a corresponding record. Further, Ang's unique identifiers are not even related to transaction records as in claim 1." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments. For example, Ang teaches "assigning and entering unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structures" can be interpreted as (i.e., to display a particular target record, each target **record is displayed in a genealogical tree** with its eldest ancestor record, parent records connecting the target record to the ancestor, sibling records, and all children of the target record… each of the pointers… includes either the **unique identifiers** or the sequential indices… that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed. **This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records**; [0049]). Simply stated

Ang links the records by using a pointer which included the unique identifiers to forming the hierarchical tree structures.

Furthermore, Appellant argues that Ang's "unique identifiers does not occur on the same device that receives an order for a transaction and stores a corresponding record." Examiner respectfully disagrees with these arguments. For example, Ang discloses the **portable database file** is **delivered to the portable computer**, additional software loaded onto the portable computer is used to **render and view the data contained in the portable database file on the portable computing device**. In step S430, the text builder program reads records from **the portable database file and creates a hierarchy for the data therein**, in BCEML, using an algorithm to arrange the hierarchy into a conventional genealogical structure. To display a particular target record, each target record is displayed in a genealogical tree with its eldest ancestor record, parent records connecting the target record to the ancestor, sibling records, and all children of the target record. The text builder, or "hierarchy builder", produces the desired output using tags derived from the customized BCEML markup language, to create objects such as hyperlinks, bolded text, and the styled formatting to be viewed on the display of the portable computing device; [0049]). Simply stated the "portable database file" is integrated within the "portable computer." Therefore, the assignment and entering of the unique identifiers does occur on the same device that receives an order for a transaction and stores a corresponding record.

On the other hand, Examiner appreciates the interpretation description given by Appellant in response. Appellant argues that the "unique identifiers are not even related to transaction records as in claim 1", however there are no description or language indicative of limiting the interpretation of these limitations. Therefore, taking into consideration but without drawing the limitations from the specification into the claim, the terminology "transaction records" can be interpreted as (i.e., record in a database; [0046]). However, in order to make the record clearer the Examiner would like to point to the Gibson's reference in which Gibson displayed the "transaction records" in FIG. 2 by illustrates steps carried out during the processing of an **order transaction**. The public data network ordering service of the merchant is in the form of Web pages stored on server 8 including images of products along with descriptions and **prices enabling customers to view and select the products**; [0041]).

Overall, unless the Appellant further clarify the broad limitations of the independent claims, the Examiner can give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation. Because, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) 2106 and 2145 stated:

> "USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). **Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not**

be read into the claim. E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "**in view of the specification**" **without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily**)." Although the claims are interpreted "in view of the specification", "limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F. 2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (Claims to be superconducting magnet which generates a "uniform magnetic field" were not limited to the degree of magnetic field uniformity required Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) imaging. Although the specification disclosed that the claimed magnet may be used in an NMR apparatus, **the claims were not so limited**.); Constant v. Advanced Mircro-Devices, Inc., 848 F.2d 1560, 1571-72, 7 USPQ2d 1057, 1064-1065 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 892 (1988) (Various limitations on which appellant relied were not stated in the claims; the specification did not provide evidence indicating these limitations must be read into the claims to give meaning to the disputed terms.; Ex parte McCullough, 7 USPQ2d 1889, 1891 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987)(Claimed electrode was rejected as obvious despite assertions that electrode functions differently than would be expected when used in nonaqueous battery since "although the demonstrated results may be germane to the patentability of a battery containing appellant's electrode,

they are not germane to the patentability of the invention claimed on appeal.")

As to point (B), in rejecting claim 1, Appellant argues that "there is no interaction between any two entities in Ang, Gibson, or the combination thereof, comparable to the interaction between the claimed 'record collection si[t]e' and 'central storage site' in limitations 6 and 7 of claim 1." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant's arguments. For example, both Ang and Gibson teach the "record collection site" and the "central storage site". Ang teaches the "record collection site" (i.e., see FIG. 1, Portable Computing Device 120) and the "central storage site" (i.e., see FIG. 1, Central Database 105). Furthermore, Gibson teaches the "record collection site" (i.e., see FIG. 1, Merchant Location 7) and the "central storage site" (i.e., see FIG. 1, Processing System 19). Therefore, the interaction between the two entities are that they both communication transaction records over a network.

As to point (C), in rejecting claim 2, Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "production of aggregate reports of transaction-related records at a record collection site and subsequent transfer of the aggregate reports to a central storage site." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant's arguments. For example, Ang teaches "production of aggregate reports of transaction-related records at a record collection site and subsequent transfer of the aggregate reports to a central storage site" (i.e., first, a map is built between the unique identifier on the central

relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database. For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]). Simply stated the aggregate report of records (e.g., unique identifiers) is being recorded at the portable computing device 120 and subsequent transfer of the aggregate report of records (e.g., unique identifiers) to the central database 105 as shown in FIG. 1.

As to point (D), in rejecting claims 6 and 7, Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest “aggregate reports of transaction-related records... regarding how aggregate reports are produced." These arguments are similar to that in point (C) above. Please see point (C) above for reference. Furthermore, Ang teaches in FIG. 8A-FIG. 8E that the records’ “title/subtitle” being displayed are to be combined with the unique identifiers.

As to point (E), in rejecting claims 9-16 and 30-32, Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest “send[ing] an aggregate report of record type counts at the record collection site based on the unique identifiers in the hierarchical tree structure, the aggregate report being sent to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant's

arguments. For example, Ang teaches “send[ing] an aggregate report of record type counts at the record collection site based on the unique identifiers in the hierarchical tree structure, the aggregate report being sent to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site" (i.e., in step S430, **the text builder program reads records from the portable database file and creates a hierarchy for the data therein**, in BCEML, using an algorithm to arrange the hierarchy into a conventional genealogical structure. To display a particular target record, each target record is displayed in a genealogical tree with its eldest ancestor record, parent records connecting the target record to the ancestor, sibling records, and all children of the target record… **The text builder itself consists of three routines**. The first routine produces a list of the top level of the hierarchy applied to the data. Each item in the list is a hyperlink. If such hyperlink is tapped on, the list will expand under such item to show the levels beneath, in accordance the overall hierarchical structure of the data. The second routine is applied to build the hierarchy tree itself. The second routine handles all of the indentation and bulleting used in many hierarchical tree layouts, and uses the recursively implemented algorithm described above to arrange the genealogical hierarchy. The third and final routine in the text builder displays the last, or lowest level, item in a tree in a specified format; [0049]-[0050]). Simply stated the central storage site (Central Database 105) is separate from the record collection site (Portable Computing Device 120), because Ang teaches creating a hierarchy for the data in the portable database and the portable database resides inside of the portable computing device.

As to point (F), in rejecting claims 17-20 and 33-35, Appellant argues that Ang in view of Gibson fails to teach or suggest "using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant's arguments. For example, Ang teaches "using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site" (i.e., a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database. For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]). Simply stated, the unique identifiers are being used to retrieve the records for data conversion. Also, once the portable database file is delivered to the portable computer, additional software loaded onto the portable computer is used to render and view the data contained in the portable database file on the portable computing device… Furthermore, **each of the pointers used as such includes either the unique identifiers** or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed. **This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records**; [0049]). Therefore, this can be interpreted as "using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site."

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing arguments, Examiner respectfully requests the Honorable Board of Appeals to sustain the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

/Truong V Vo/
Examiner, Art Unit 2156
07/20/2010

Conferees:

/Pierre M. Vital/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2156

/Tim T. Vo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168